

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/841,894	04/25/2001	Patricia A. Billing-Medel	6083.US.D2	6734
7590 11/03/2003			EXAMINER	
Steven F. Weinstock			FREDMAN, JEFFREY NORMAN	
Abbott Laboratories Department 377 / AP6D-2			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
100 Abbott Park Road			1634	
Abbott Park, IL 60064-6050			DATE MAILED: 11/03/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/841,894	BILLING-MEDEL ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey Fredman	1634
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the co	: rrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 02 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearamentation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (i) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>24 June 2003</u> . App 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF)		•
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of t	finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		, —
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 10-16, 33,35,38 and 39.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 23-32 and	<u>34</u> .	
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:		
		Jeffrey Fredman Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1634

C ntinuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/841,894

Applicati n No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new limitation which requires a minimum of "10 nucleotides" would require further search and consideration..

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that their previous response overcomes the written description rejection. This is not persuasive for the reasons of record. With regard to the prior art rejections, these arguments are not persuasive because the amendment was not entered, as requiring further search and consideration.

1